DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 839 EA 005 283

TITLE	The Preparation and Certification of Educational Administrators: A UCEA Commission Report and Summary.
INSTITUTION	University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; *Administrator Selection; *Certification; *Educational Administration; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Needs; Leadership; *Management Development; Management Education; Manpower Development; Manpower Needs; Research; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This document reports the results of a study conducted to (1) study the impact of certification on talent flow into administration and leadership development of educational administrators; (2) assess the degree to which there are negative consequences or inadequate uses of certification requirements and processes; (3) identify, reassess and/or reformulate the purposes that certification should serve; (4) develop recommendations for improving certification requirements, for making their administration more effective, and for helping ensure optimal use of them; and (5) develop guidelines for encouraging effective use of the study findings. Certification was assessed from the dual perspectives of content and process. The study emphasized talent flow from the point of recruitment and selection of candidates for preparation to the point of initial entry into educational administration positions. Presentations of the study procedures, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are included. (Author/DN)

ED 079839

THE PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS: A UCEA COMMISSION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

University Council for Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

EA 005 283

January, 1973

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Acknowledgements

Appreciation is expressed to a number of individuals who did special work for the Commission: Ken Ostrander who, as a UCEA Staff Affiliate, gathered substantial data and presented several written reports to the Commission; to Ronald Hoekstra, Arthur Taylor, David Sperry, and Don Vickers who made oral or written presentations to the Commission; and to Robin Farquhar, Jackson Newell, and Rodney Pirtle who prepared background materials and contributed to the planning and preparation of this report. Appreciation is also expressed to all members of the Commission for reviewing written materials, for providing information and for offering ideas which helped shape the report.

The cooperation and encouragement of the organizations which the various Commission members represented were highly valued and deserve recognition. Special appreciation is expressed to the 49 state certification officers (out of 50) who provided data on the numbers of institutions preparing administrators in the various states and to Elizabeth Lloyd who, as president of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, helped the UCEA central staff make contacts with these officers.

Finally, gratitude is expressed to Harriet Ferrell, Barbara McCaman, and Margaret Tossey for assistance provided in typing background papers and the various drafts of this report.

Jack A. Culbertson

Commission Members and the Organizations Represented*

Howard Bretsch, University of Rochester
George Droubie, Minnesota Department of Education
Charles Faber, University of Kentucky
Byron Hansford, Council of Chief State School Officers
Howard Heding, University of Missouri
Willard Lane, University of Iowa
Elizabeth Lloyd, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
Richard Millard, Education Commission of the States
Kenneth Ostrander, University of Washington
William Pharis, National Association of Elementary School Principals
Craig Phillips, North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction
Gordon Purrington, State University of New York at Albany
Edwin Read, University of Utah
Norman Scharer, American Association of School Administrators
Jay Scribner, University of California at Los Angeles
Theodore Southerland, National Association of Secondary School Principals
Frederick Staub, The Ohio State University
Dustin Wilson, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, United States Office of Education

* Appreciation is expressed to other individuals who accepted membership on the Commission initially but, because of changes in positions, found it necessary to resign: Sidney Marland, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Don Dafoe, University of Alaska; and Robert Binswanger, Director of the Experimental Schools Program, United States Office of Education.

Appreciation is also expressed to David Sperry, University of Utah; James T. Burch and Arthur Taylor of the State Department of Public Instruction in North Carolina; Richard Williams of the University of California at Los Angeles; and Floyd W. Parsons of the American Association of School Administrators for special assistance provided the Commission.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of a UCEA-sponsored commission to examine certification practices affecting the preparation and placement of educational administrators was formulated in 1969. It grew out of UCEA planning processes which were concerned, among other things, with the following question: What barriers are impeding the flow of leadership talent into preparatory programs and, in turn, into leadership posts in education? While it was recognized that the question was a very complex one with many ramifications and possible answers, certification was identified as one possible barrier to effective leadership flow. Therefore, the goal of establishing a UCEA-sponsored commission to examine certification standards and practices was formulated. Incorporated into the 1969-74 UCEA Plan, the Commission became one of two projects concerned with talent flow in educational administration.[1]

Because personnel in such diverse agencies as state education departments, school districts, institutions of higher education and professional organizations have an interest and knowledge of certification, broad representation on the Commission was sought. Approximately half of the Commission members came from universities. These members were chosen on the basis of expressed interest in certification and to represent different regions of the nation. Regional representation was sought in order to facilitate data-gathering in state education agencies and to ensure informed regional leadership capability in projected meetings to follow the Commission report.

Half of the Commission represented agencies other than universities. It was assumed that schools and school systems could best be represented through national organizations of principals and school superintendents. The same principle was followed largely for certification officers in state education agencies.

Five general objectives were established to guide the work of the Commission. These may be summarized as follows:

1. To study the impact of certification on talent flow and leadership development in educational administration.

[1] A second project, coordinated by Joan Egner, Professor of Educational Administration, Cornell University, is focusing upon perceived barriers affecting entry into school administration of leading college seniors attending different institutions of higher education.

2. To assess the degree to which there are negative consequences or inadequate uses of certification requirements and processes.

3. To identify, reassess and, if desirable, reformulate the purposes which certification should serve.

4. To develop recommendations for improving certification requirements; for making their administration more effective; and for helping ensure optimal use of them.

5. To develop guidelines for encouraging effective use of the recommendations to be developed by the Commission.

Certification was assessed from the dual perspectives of content and process. This meant that certification standards and the role of agencies involved in or affected by their implementation were examined. The major emphasis was upon talent flow from the point of recruitment and selection of candidates for preparation to the point of initial entry into educational administration positions.

As the Commission deliberated, it became ever clearer that the threads of both preparation (including recruitment and selection) and certification processes are inextricably interwoven into the tapestry of educational administration. While this report tends to focus on the certification process, attempts have been made to relate the two, particularly at their closest points of tangency.

Set forth on the pages which follow are the study procedures and findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission. It is hoped that these will prove useful to local, state, and national leaders interested in assessing certification standards and processes toward the end of improving recruitment and preparation and, in turn, leadership in schools.

STUDY PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

Data Gathering Procedures

Various procedures were used to gather data related to the work of the Certification Commission. Some of these focused upon certification standards per se; others on perceptions which selected individuals and groups had toward certain aspects of certification; and still others on trends, events, and conditions in the larger society which have an effect on how certification standards and procedures impact on the flow of leadership talent in educational administration. Among the procedures and data used were the following:

The study of data on national training capability and on supply and demand for trained administrators. Data on the growth in the number of administrative positions during the last three decades were analyzed and contrasted with data on projected numbers of administrators in the seventies. Available information on current supplies of certificated administrative personnel were also assembled and studied. Finally, data were gathered from more than 350 institutions offering programs in educational administration; these were presented to show patterns of growth in the national capability as measured by numbers of institutions and programs in differing decades.

The study of pertinent literature. Three classes of literature were examined pertinent to the Commission's work. One included references illuminating external conditions, forces, legal decisions and other matters impinging upon certification. An example of literature in this class would be writings of critics concerned with the negative impact of credentialism, including certification. The second class of literature included information directly related to certification standards, practices, and procedures and their relationship to preparatory programs. A study of reciprocity practices would be an example of this latter type of literature. Finally, the literature on preparatory programs was reviewed. This class of literature would be illustrated by a survey of trends in the preparation of operations research specialists.

Analysis of questionnaire data obtained from state education agencies. A questionnaire was sent to certification officers in all state education agencies. The general purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain information about certification requirements, recent changes in requirements and the administration of requirements. Information was sought concerning experience, degree and course requirements for principals and superintendents; the administration of certification, including the use of approved programs, reciprocity arrangements, experimental programs and the use of "equivalencies"; changes in certification during the last five years and plans for changes in the future, if any; and state groups which were perceived

to be most influential in bringing about changes in certification. More than 90 per cent of the states responded to the questionnaire. The data obtained were supplemented by survey information on the flexibility of requirements in the various states vis-a-vis individuals with unconventional experience and educational backgrounds.

The more general state education agency questionnaire concentrated largely on principals and superintendents. Each of the professors on the Commission was responsible for obtaining data from the five states within his immediate region.

The analysis of questionnaire data obtained from those heading departments of educational administration in universities. Questionnaires were sent to approximately 250 heads of departments of educational administration throughout the United States. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain data on the perceived impact of state certification requirements. More specifically, data were obtained on the degree to which certification was perceived to affect negatively the recruitment, admission and placement of school principals and superintendents. This questionnaire was distributed from the offices of UCEA and the data were organized and analyzed by UCEA staff. Eighty per cent of the department heads returned the questionnaire.

Development of written position papers and reports prepared by Commission members and the UCEA staff. Several background papers were prepared to facilitate the work of the Commission. Three papers, for example, were written and presented on different aspects of flexibility and its implications for certification and preparation. Various other reports were prepared on the status and impact of certification and preparation.

Informal interviews held with enrollees in preparatory programs who had unconventional backgrounds. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain data on the degree to which certification requirements were perceived to affect the placement of individuals with unique backgrounds in posts of administrative practice in school systems. Most of the students were interviewed in the universities where they were enrolled. A few who came from very unconventional backgrounds (e.g., the ministry), and who were enrolled in the National Program of Educational Leadership, were interviewed by the Commission members as a group to gain insights into certification and leadership talent flow in education.

Information on certification and preparatory programs obtained from Commission members. Since most of the Commission members had knowledge of national developments related to certification, they presented testimony on these developments during the sessions held. For example, light was shed upon developments with regard to reciprocity, competency-based certification, approved program practices, the nature of preparation programs and related matters. Information and views were also provided by

Commission members on developments in university preparatory programs which were believed to have implications for certification.

FINDINGS

Growth in the National Training Capability

One measure of the national training capability in educational administration in 1972 was reflected in the fact that 362 institutions in the United States were offering programs of preparation; approximately 130 of these institutions were offering doctoral programs. Two hundred and eighty-four of the 362 institutions and the two Canadian universities belonging to UCEA responded to a questionnaire distributed in 1972.[2] Of the 286 institutions responding, 261 had Masters programs in educational administration; 161 had Specialist or two-year programs; 42 had Ed. D. programs; 20 had Ph. D. programs; and 56 had both Ph. D. and Ed. D. programs. Other evidence suggests that there are at least 10 additional institutions from among non-respondents which offer the doctoral degree in educational administration.

The most rapidly expanding program during the 1940-70 period was the Specialist or two-year program which grew twenty-fold. In 1940 the number of specialist programs was seven; by 1970 the number had grown to 145. The sixties was the decade of most explosive growth for this program. Growth was undoubtedly stimulated by the vote in the early 1960's by the American Association of School Administrators requiring its members to have two years of graduate preparation. This requirement, in turn, was translated into accreditation standards which in turn influenced program expansion.

The least rapidly growing program during the 1940-70 period was the Ph. D. offering; however, its growth accelerated in each succeeding decade. In 1940 there were 38 Ph. D. programs offered by the responding institutions. Seven programs were added in the forties, nine in the fifties, and 19 in the sixties. Thus, the number of programs added during the 1941-70 period was less than the number in existence in 1940. During the same period, the number of Ed. D. programs more than tripled and the number of Masters programs almost tripled.

The numbers of students graduating from preparatory programs, especially in the 1960's, grew even more rapidly than did the number of programs. In 1965, the available data shows that the number of doctoral degrees in educational administration awarded to candidates was 651; by 1970 the number had grown to 1014 for an increase of 71 per cent in five years. During the same period the number of Ph. D. programs grew by 12 per cent and the

---

[2]For a full report of the study see Jack Culbertson. "Alternative Strategies of Program Adaptation Within the Future Time Frame of the Seventies." in Samuel Popper (Ed) Imaging Alternative Future School Organizations. (In Preparation).

number of Ed.D. programs by 23 per cent. During the 1965-70 period the number of Masters degrees awarded grew 37 per cent while the number of Masters programs grew by eight per cent.

Even in the face of diminishing quantitative training demands, there will likely be continued expansion during the seventies in the number of institutions engaged in preparation and the number of programs offered. The forces that brought about program expansion in past decades will create further expansion during the seventies, even though the demand for new principals and other administrators will be much less than in past decades. The data shows, for example, that 17 new Masters, 13 new Specialist, seven new Ed.D. and four new Ph.D. programs came into being during the 1970-72 period. Plans for even larger numbers of these programs during the 1972-74 period were reported. Even though program expansion will undoubtedly slow during the last half of the decade as diminishing training demand patterns are better understood, continued quantitative growth in the national training capability during this decade seems assured.

Supply of and Demand for Trained Administrators

Available evidence suggests that individuals certified for administrative posts in school systems exceeds substantially the number of available openings. Studies in various states over the years have highlighted the general tendency to prepare and certify many more personnel than there are available administrative posts. A recent study by Mitchell and Hawley showed that 21 out of 37 states reported an over-supply of personnel.[3] Five of the states reported a "great many more people than openings." In New York State, for example, there were 203 school principal openings in 1969-70 but more than 15,000 personnel certified by the state for these posts. Even if it is recognized that many of the individuals certified are not now motivated to enter posts of educational administration or, if they are, would likely not be seriously considered, the overproduction problem is still marked in many states.

The populations of practicing principals in 1980 will be smaller than the 1970 population. The population of practicing public school principals grew sharply during the 1940-70 period. The number in 1950 was 25 per cent greater than the number in 1940; in the fifties the growth in the number was more than 50 per cent; and in the sixties the number increased by more than 50 per cent again. The sharp growth in numbers of positions created strong training demands and this helps to explain the marked expansion in the number of training institutions during the 1940-70 period. However, training demands in the seventies will contrast sharply with those of the fifties and

[3]Donald Mitchell and Anne Hawley. Leadership in Public Education Study. Washington: Academy for Educational Development, 1972, p. 34.

sixties since it is likely that the number of practicing principals in 1980 will be five per cent less than the number in 1970.[4]

The demand for highly trained administrative personnel grew sharply in the 1960's because of the creation of many new leadership posts in education. As already implied, there were many professorship posts created in the sixties by the sharp expansion in programs to prepare educational administrators. New federal legislation also increased rapidly the need for newly prepared administrative personnel more generally. New talent was needed for research and development centers and for regional laboratories; for expanded state and federal education agencies; for Title III and other experimental and federally funded programs; for new opportunities in the expanding education industries; and for leadership posts in higher education which steadily increased in number.

The demand for those with recently acquired doctorates to enter posts in departments of educational administration (and in related agencies) has diminished sharply in recent years. Even though preparatory programs continue to increase in number, the expansion is more at the specialist and Masters level; further, there seems to be considerable re-deployment of staff rather than the addition of new staff as diminishing demands for newly prepared teachers and other personnel have their impact. It is also clear that the federal investment in education has leveled off and in some cases has even been cut back. This means that the need for highly trained new personnel in 1972 to enter posts in regional laboratories, state education agencies, and Title III Centers, for example, is not nearly as great as it was in the mid and late sixties. The result is a negative impact on the demand for personnel with newly acquired doctorates in educational administration.

Only a few state departments have begun to gather and store pertinent data for making needed forecasts, and for facilitating manpower planning related to educational administration. A few states, such as New York and Michigan, have developed the necessary data-gathering and storage systems to begin to facilitate manpower studies which can encourage better state planning and wiser responses on the part of training institutions. New York State, for example, establishes a "data day" each year when every school system provides statistics of various kinds having to do with personnel and related matters. These data, which are stored on computer-based systems, can be made available to those interested in studying supply and demand characteristics. The New York State Education Agency has not as yet developed the capability to do the supply and demand studies itself, although these are under discussion, and pertinent data are available for the 1969-72 period.

---

[4]Jack Culbertson. op. cit., p. 21-23.

Discussions of trained manpower issues, which are going on in a number of states, are undoubtedly being stimulated by the growing concern on the part of state legislators, governors and other individuals responsible for state budgets. This perhaps helps to explain why some states are beginning to develop better supply-demand data to facilitate more effective manpower planning.

Trends in Preparation Programs

During the last decade there has been a growing body of knowledge on various aspects of programs for preparing educational administrators. Much of the pertinent literature is oriented toward prescribing ideal components of preparatory programs in contrast to describing and evaluating current trends.[5] However, several references have dealt with preparation practices and these can be drawn upon to depict trends and points of view. Selected findings highlighting important trends follow:[6]

Since the late sixties there has been a trend toward stating the purpose of preparation in more specific and operational terms. This trend is reflected in the increased use in recent years of such terms as "performance criteria," "administrator competencies," and "behavioral objectives." Stimulating concern about more specific definitions of "competency," among others, has been the growing emphasis upon accountability and the desire on the part of different publics to know what institutions are doing to prepare administrators, why they are doing it, and how well they are doing it. A 1969 publication, for example, set forth behavioral objectives for school superintendents as guides for program design.[7] A publication of the National Association of Secondary Principals presented concepts highlighting criteria

[5]Robin Farquhar and Philip Piele. Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

[6]Information on program trends as presented in Chapters Ten, Eleven, and Twelve of Jack Culbertson, et al. Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies, (Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1969) has influenced substantially the findings presented on preparation. Also see Robin Farquhar and Michael Martin. "New Developments in the Preparation of Educational Leaders." Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1972, pp. 26-30. Also see Daniel Creamer and Barbara Feld. "Some Innovations in the Training of Educational Leaders." New York: The Conference Board, Inc., 1972.

[7]Jack Culbertson, et al. Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies, pp. 269-70.

for high school principals,[8] and a series of statements, developed more recently by Atlanta Public School and UCEA leaders, concentrated upon elaborating in some detail performance criteria designed to apply to both elementary and secondary principals.[9] The University of Utah has also evolved a distinct approach to defining and using competencies as a base for preparation.[10] Data presented in these and other reports, it should be made clear, suggest that the movement toward performance-based preparation and certification is still in very early stages of development. However, readiness for needed progress has been clearly established.

In the fifties and the sixties a trend toward incorporating into preparatory programs concepts, theories and research findings from the social and behavioral sciences was clearly established.[11] Disciplines from which content was typically drawn, were sociology, political science, economics, and social psychology. The most frequently utilized approach for incorporating content was to send students "across campus" to take courses. Other approaches involved interdisciplinary seminars, specially designed courses by social scientists, and courses offered by recently prepared professors of educational administration who had acquired grounding in a social science discipline or studied in an interdisciplinary program.

A survey in the late sixties showed that both professors and administrators valued the trend.[12] In more recent years, however, there has been some questioning by scholars and practitioners of the usefulness of social science content achieved to this point. However, the criticisms are not

---

[8]Lloyd McCleary and Kenneth McIntyre. "Competency Development and University Methodology: A Model and Proposal" in Where Will They Find It? Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1972.

[9]Jack Culbertson, Curtis Henson, and Ruel Morrison (Eds). Performance Criteria for Principals. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Jones Publishing Co., 1973.

[10]Lloyd McCleary. "The Development of a Competency Based Individualized Program." UCEA Newsletter, Vol. XIV, No. 2, December, 1972, pp. 2-4.

[11]Keith Goldhammer. The Social Sciences and the Preparation of Educational Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1963. For a comprehensive treatment of the trend see Jack Culbertson, et al. Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1973.

[12]Jack Culbertson, et al. Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies, pp. 238-39.

directed so much toward eliminating social science content as toward making it more relevant to the practice of educational administration.

In the mid and late sixties a number of institutions began to incorporate content from the humanities into preparatory programs. Three somewhat distinct rationales evolved for incorporating content from the humanities. One rationale was centered in the concept of a liberal education. Those accepting this rationale argued that the liberal thinker possessed a broadened base for decision making and an enlightened perspective for understanding societal problems and their impingement on education; further, that content from the humanities could provide enlightened perspectives and sounder bases for decision making. A second rationale was centered on the concept of values. Content from the humanities, according to this view, could illuminate important value conflicts and shed light on societal and educational purposes in ways that would inform leadership. Finally, content from the humanities, it was argued by some, could be incorporated into programs in ways that would help prospective administrators become more creative. Administrators by understanding art and the artist, for example, could gain insights useful in understanding the creative or artistic aspects of educational administration. These insights, in turn, could provide a base for enhanced creativity on their part.

Leaders responsible for programs of preparation have experimented with each of the three rationales just noted. In a number of the institutions where leaders pioneered experiments with humanities content, it continues to be used in preparatory programs. In other institutions leaders are experimenting with the approach for the first time.[13]

The last decade saw a growing interest in developing new approaches to preparing educational, business, government, and other administrators in common programs. As Miklos has noted, there are two assumptions underlying the "training-in-common" approach. First, "there are indeed similarities of sufficient significance among the administrative processes to warrant a generalized approach"; and, second, there is "some body of content, a core, that will serve the needs of administrators in all fields."[14] Miklos has identified a number of developments related to the trend and has described in some detail the three programs offered by the University of

[13]For a detailed report on the use of the humanities in preparation see Robin Farquhar, The Humanities in Preparing Educational Administrators. ERIC Clearinghouse, University of Oregon, 1970.

[14]Erwin Miklos. Training-In-Common for Educational, Public, and Business Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1972, p. 5.

California at Irvine, by Sangamon State University, and by the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan. Most of the programs now being offered provide opportunities to those admitted to have training that is common as well as training that is differentiated to special aspects of a given field (e.g., business administration). On some campuses existing schools of business, education, and public administration have combined efforts in a coordinated approach. In other institutions special schools of administration have been created.

During the sixties the content of preparatory programs became considerably more specialized and staffs in departments of educational administration acquired more discipline- and interdisciplinary-based knowledge and skill. Specialization has been influenced significantly by the use of content in social science disciplines. Thus, in contrast to ten years ago, there are now bodies of concepts and findings on the economics of education and the politics of education. Specialization has also been shaped by concepts developed and tested initially within the context of organizations other than schools. For example, systems analysis and operations research, which has had increasing use in educational administration, were developed initially within business and military organizations and diffused into the educational arena.

Professors during the last decade have had more specialized preparation than previously and resident on-campus preparation has increased markedly. Thus, there are fewer individuals in departments who teach a wide array of courses from a generalist perspective than previously and a much greater number that specialize in selected aspects of knowledge bearing upon educational administration. This means that there is greater diversity of perspective on the part of professors with a resulting fragmentation in outlook which has created problems in achieving professional cohesion. However, the specialization has led to the significant improvement of dissertation research and strengthened the content of preparatory programs.

The late sixties and early seventies witnessed new approaches designed to achieve greater flexibility in preparatory programs. The Commission received reports from several universities on approaches to flexibility in programs. Among the approaches examined by the Commission were New York University's use of "Individual Learning Systems for Administrators," which features independent study; the University of Massachusetts' approach to flexibility through the development of a substantial number of "modules" from which students with different backgrounds can choose; the University of Utah "negotiations process" in which professors and students create learning experiences related to identified competencies; and the inter-institutional National Program of Educational Leadership approach which tailors learning entirely to the defined needs of individual students. Other evidences of flexibility are found in the elimination or reduction of foreign language and related requirements in doctoral programs, the development of programs

related to such different career options as research and administration, the employment of a wider range of instructional methods used, and more varied physical and social environments to facilitate learning.

Accompanying the trend toward greater flexibility, paradoxically, has been a trend oriented toward the attainment of more clearly defined program structure. As already noted, programs are being structured so that they relate more directly to career goals and to administrator competencies. This means, for example, that programs are structured so that there are clear options for those planning to follow career goals associated with research or administration. Or, programs in some institutions are structured, to take another example, so that an emphasis is placed upon urban in contrast to rural or suburban administration. Or, programs in a number of institutions are structured to offer prospective specialists depth preparation in a given area such as quantitative analysis.[15]

A number of institutions are also seeking to structure more clearly the component parts of programs as, for example: relationships between common cores in programs for all administrators and specialized bases for those desiring to enter particular positions; relationships between academic and field experiences; and the most desirable sequence of learning activities.

In the recruitment of administrators during the last decade a distinct tendency developed to expand the pools from which prospective candidates are sought. Among the pools receiving greater emphasis in recruitment are women, younger persons with less experience in teaching and administration, individuals in mid-career who have had no experience with education but who have demonstrated leadership in other areas, and members of minority groups including Chicanos, American Indians, and Blacks.[16] This trend toward a broadening of the talent pool has also been accompanied by more systematic and aggressive efforts at recruitment and increased financial assistance for candidates accepted into preparatory programs.

There has also been a trend toward more flexible use of admission and selection criteria in preparatory programs. A number of universities have placed substantially greater emphasis in recent years on demonstrated leadership qualities in admitting candidates and on the search for individuals who are dissatisfied with the status quo in education. Put differently, greater emphasis is being placed upon criteria that are non-cognitive in nature, although traditional tests of intelligence and knowledge are being used. However, the latter are being supplemented by additional criteria and

[15]James Bruno. The Preparation of School Administrators in Quantitative Analysis. Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1973.

[16]Robert Stout. New Approaches to the Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1973.

data related to leadership potential. In addition, traditional tests are being used more flexibly because of their potential for encouraging social class and racial discrimination in the selection of leaders.

There has also been a tendency to see admission and selection as an ongoing process rather than one limited to the single point of entry into preparatory programs. This increases the need for continuing diagnosis of candidates and for the re-evaluation of selection decisions at a number of points in program, including those related to field experience.

For more than a decade a major trend in instructional approaches has been away from a strong reliance upon the traditional lecture-textbook methods and toward a much more varied methodology supported by cases, simulations, games, and multi-media materials.[17] In the early 1960's, the first simulations were made available in educational administration in the form of the "Whitman School" in "Jefferson Township."[18] This simulation was followed by others, including the various "Madison" simulations[19] and, in turn, by the "Monroe City" simulations.[20] These materials were all based upon data gathered from actual school systems and were presented in a variety of audio-visual and written media. During the late 1960's, computer-based simulations became available and began to be used.[21] In the mid-sixties, the first management game in educational administration was created, and the number of cases available for instruction grew throughout the 1960's and early seventies. In addition to using a greater number of

[17]Richard Wynn. Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972. See also James Yates. "Selected Instructional Materials Judged Relevant to Educational Administration." Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

[18]John Hemphill, et al. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962. Also see Jack Culbertson and William H. Coffield. Simulation in Administrative Training. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1960.

[19]Jack Culbertson. Revising and Updating the Jefferson Township Simulation Materials. Project No. 6-1241, Contract No. OEC 3-6-061241-0651, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, December, 1967. Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1967.

[20]John A. Blough, et al. The Simulation of an Urban School System for Use in Preparing Educational Administrators. Project No. 9-0544, Grant No. OEG 0-70-4757(508) Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1971.

[21]Wailand Bessent and Philip Piele. The Use of the Computer in Administrator Preparation. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

reality-oriented materials in preparatory programs, professors were experimenting with other methods. Among these were sensitivity training, independent study, the laboratory approach, and role playing, for example.

During the last few decades the quantity and variety of field experiences in preparatory programs increased substantially.[22] The internship is one type of field-oriented experience that has received increased emphasis in preparation and has undergone experimentation and innovation. The "rotating internship" was put into practice at Teachers College, Columbia University, for example, enabling interested individuals preparing for administrative posts to have internship experiences during their period of preparation. Stanford University, among others, developed internships for administrators in agencies outside the school system; and Cornell, Rochester, Buffalo and Syracuse created a cooperative internship program which was supplemented by seminars for students from all four universities.

Various approaches to field experience other than the internship have been developed, and the following examples are illustrative: The University of Florida in cooperation with the Dade County, Florida,and the Atlanta Public School systems, developed and tested "field stations" in which student groups participated for several months experiencing a range of learning opportunities; the University of Wisconsin placed trainees in six large urban school systems, and each intern was visited twice monthly over a year's period by two professors from the University of Wisconsin; Washington State University developed a flexible field experience approach which enabled students on short notice to visit and examine significant but unexpected educational developments in the Northwest; a number of institutions in Michigan, with support from the Mott Foundations, developed a "clinical" preparation program which was centered within the Flint School System; Florida State University has evolved field experiences involving work by students in special efforts such as model cities programs; Harvard University has used field surveys to acquaint students with significant policy problems in education; the University of New Mexico has provided students opportunities to observe state legislative processes related to education from various perspectives and to come together in groups to share the learnings obtained from these perspectives; and so forth.

Origins and Purposes of Certification

The certification of educational administrators by state education agencies is an American phenomenon. It emerged from the more general exper-

[22]Joseph M. Cronin and Peter M. Horoschak. Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

ience with teacher certification, which, according to Kinney, began at the county level about 1825.[23] Almost three decades later it was applied to educational administrators.

The growth of certification for school administration took place almost entirely in this century. The first administrative certificate was designed for the superintendent, and it came into being, according to Howsam and Morphet, in 1854 in Pennsylvania.[24] It was not until the first part of this century that additional certificates were added. Since 1911, when New Jersey and Pennsylvania established the first principal certificates, the practice has gradually spread. By 1957, 45 states had certificates for superintendents, 46 for secondary principals, and 45 for elementary principals.[25] Today, every state offers certificates for school administrators except Michigan.

Certification for administrators, as for other educational personnel, is a process of legal sanction by states enabling individuals with credentials to be eligible for positions in schools. Certification requirements are presumed to represent desired standards of preparation. The legal justification for certificates applies to "professionals" and was stated sometime ago by Knutson as follows:[26]

> "The general rule which has been formulated in this field by many legislative and judicial decisions is that only those occupations which directly affect the public safety, morals, and general welfare and which accordingly distinguish themselves from other occupations should be licensed."

Thus, legal justification for certification originally was centered in the interests of the state. More recently, as is demonstrated below, this justification has come into conflict with legal principles centering more upon interests of individuals.

A long-standing and frequently stated purpose of certification is to protect the public against incompetents in school systems. Frazier has stated

---

[23]Lucian Kinney. Certification in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 44.

[24]Robert Howsam and Edgar Morphet. "Certification of Educational Administrators," Journal of Teacher Education, March 1958, Vol. IX, No. 1, p. 79.

[25]Ibid., p. 79.

[26]Quoted in Council of State Governments. Occupational License and Legislation in the States. Chicago: The Council, 1952, p. 58.

the case in relation to teachers as follows:[27]

> "The primary purpose of teacher certification, as traditionally administered, is to protect the State against incompetent teachers. It protects the State against waste in the expenditure of public school funds; protects pupils against ill prepared teachers, and protects teachers against the unfair competition of those not qualified."

Although protection against incompetence is one of the long-standing stated purposes of certification, it is not the only one. Critics have argued, for example, that certification also serves the interests of professional practitioners themselves.[28] Some have noted that certification processes can be used to bring about improvements in preparing institutions and can lead to a higher quality of preparation.

Current Certification Requirements

Even though all states except Michigan require some form of certification for prospective principals and superintendents, the experience pre-requisites and course requirements for these two administrative roles vary considerably among the states.[29] The modal teaching experience requirement for principals among the states is three years; the maximum required by any state is five years. For the school superintendency, the maximum amount of teaching experience required for certification is eight years. The modal teaching experience requirements for superintendents is three years, as it is for principals. Thirteen states require both teaching and administrative experience for school superintendency certification.

Although comparable data on course requirements were not obtained from all the states, it is clear that certain courses tend to be required much more frequently in the various states than others. The following, listed from those most frequently required to those less frequently required, were: school organization and administration, curriculum development, supervision, school finance, educational measurement, school law, school-community relations, foundations of education, evaluation research, and school plant design and operations. Other courses, which are required by fewer states, are staff development, field experience (including internship) group dynam-

---

[27] Benjamin Frazier. Development of State Programs for the Certification of Teachers. Washington: United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 6, 1940, p. 5.

[28] Lucian Kinney. op. cit., p. 4[illegible].

[29] See T. M. Stinnett. A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States. Washington, D.C: National Education Association, 1970.

ics, student personnel and business management. Some states also require social science courses.

Trends pointing to greater flexibility in certification are represented in approved program arrangements, experimental program options, reciprocity practices, and the use of equivalencies. Twenty-six states reported that they handled certification on an "approved program" basis. All but four of these states required periodic re-evaluation of "approved programs." Three of the 26 states reported they had revoked "approved programs" during the 1965-70 period.

In those states where certification may be fulfilled on the basis of an institutional approved program, at least two general patterns were identified. In one instance, the institution may be required to offer specific courses. In other instances, the institution may only meet the general requirements for certification. Typically, "approved programs" go beyond state requirements. The most frequent pattern of operation in "approved programs" is to require students to take a core of courses in educational administration and to require distribution of additional semester hours in collateral areas. More choice over course selection is available to students in collateral areas than in professional courses in educational administration.

Reciprocity agreements in eight northeastern states affecting administrator certification were reported to be in effect in 1970. A number of states indicated that they recognized work done in NCATE-approved institutions for reciprocity purposes. On the basis of recent developments in reciprocity agreements for teachers and principals, Commission members expressed views that reciprocity agreements among the states, hopefully, will achieve for superintendents the same opportunities for mobility accorded other educational personnel.

A number of states made exceptions to prescribed certification requirements for administrators through the use of "equivalencies." In six states, for example, special non-school experiences can be substituted for school experiences to meet certification requirements. Differing procedures were reported in use to make decisions about "equivalencies." Two states, for example, provide for the review of exceptional cases by the state board of education; in other states, decisions are made by state agency personnel.

There are other types of evidence bearing upon the tendency toward flexibility in administering requirements: two states permit the relaxation of requirements when individuals requesting them are already working toward advanced certification; in one state, institutions with approved programs were in a position to suspend requirements; and in another state there was a willingness on the part of certification officers to certify principals on the basis of a recommendation from an employing superintendent.

There is some evidence that leaders in institutions of higher education do not fully understand the options available for achieving greater flexibility or, if they do, they fail to take advantage of them. Twenty-three states, for example, reported that it was possible for universities and colleges to obtain approval for programs which enabled them to carry out experiments. Graduates in experimental programs would not be required, in other words, to meet existing certification requirements. However, apparently very few institutions of higher education had availed themselves of opportunities for experimentation. Only two states, Colorado and North Carolina, reported that experimental programs had been undertaken by institutions of higher education.

A substantial number of states increased certification requirements during the period 1965-70; more recently, there has been a tendency to decrease requirements. In the 18 states reporting modifications in their certification requirements, during the 1965-70 period, two trends were evident: an increase in the amount of experience and the number of course requirements for certification; and a decrease in the number of certification levels. Since 1970, there has emerged a trend countering the earlier growth in requirements; more specifically, several states have sought to decrease the number of hours required for certifying principals or superintendents. In a few states, such moves have been successful.

In 1970 several states reported they were planning to bring about changes in certification: four were considering implementing performance-based programs; five were considering changes in experience and professional course requirements; and two were considering changes in the procedures for "approved programs."

State education agency respondents identified a number of groups they judged to be influential in bringing about changes in certification. The following groups, which are listed in order from those judged most influential to those judged least influential, were mentioned most frequently: educational administrators (and their organizations); state education agencies; professors of educational administration; members of state boards of education; state advisory committees on certification; teachers and teacher organizations; deans and other university administrators; and state legislators.

Conditions and Issues of More Recent Origin

Certification, like other procedures affecting education, has come under considerable criticism in recent years. Some of the criticisms seem to be related to changing conditions affecting education, while others are more indigenous to certification itself. These criticisms deserve careful examination by those concerned with effective leadership flow in education. Therefore, some of the findings, which are causing questions to be posed about certification, are elaborated below.

During recent years some scholars have argued that there are significantly negative societal consequences to "credentialism" in its various forms, including the certification of personnel and the accreditation of institutions of higher education. Certificates, critics say, are false idols of worship. They are not true indicators of professional knowledge or skill, because they do not recognize the results of differential preparation or involve measures of on-the-job competence.[30] They tend to reinforce social class selection, because our educational institutions are middle class in orientation. In addition, it is argued that the growing emphasis upon credentials has created false demands on educational institutions, because prospective teachers and administrators enroll more for the purpose of acquiring certificates than for the purpose of pursuing inquiry or developing professional competencies. Another criticism is that the certification system, because of its excesses, creates an expensive system of training in a period when leaders responsible for higher education are becoming increasingly concerned about the limits of available resources.

Societal tendencies toward increased openness have caused questions to be raised about certification and its impact on talent flow and effective leadership. Throughout society during the last decade there have been growing demands for, and an increase in, openness in the procedures through which leadership flow is determined. This openness is reflected in the expanding involvement of constituents, both in the appointment of leaders and in their decision-making and problem-solving activities. It is also reflected in the growing incidence of nationwide movement by leaders among educational, governmental, and business organizations.

Societal tendencies toward greater openness are beginning to have an impact upon the institutional context of education. In many states, however, the mobility of school administrators is still very restricted. Mitchell and Hawley[31] have demonstrated the strong tendency of principals to remain in their native states and local areas, and a study sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators[32] showed similar tendencies among school superintendents. While no direct cause and effect relationship is implied here, the data cited in these studies support the fact that problems are encountered in moving from one state to another which relate rather directly to the process of certification.

---

[30]For an example, see Michael Marien "Beyond Credentialism: The Future of Social Selection." Social Policy, October 1971, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 14-21.

[31]Donald P. Mitchell and Anne Hawley. Loc. cit., pp. 38ff.

[32]American Association of School Administrators. The American School Superintendent: An AASA Research Study. Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1971, pp. 40-41.

Tendencies toward increased openness of leadership flow in education are also being stimulated by several other factors. One is a growth in the level of community participation in decisions about the selection and retention of educational leaders, particularly in some large cities. Another is the growing need, both perceived and actual, for larger numbers of educational leaders from minority groups to be appointed to administrative posts. A third is the effort in a growing number of school districts to seek a "new breed" of school administrator -- one who is not indoctrinated into the frequently bureaucratic traditions of established educational systems. William Wayson,[33] for example, has emphasized the need to circumvent the traditional restrictions surrounding the appointment of new school principals, if "new breed" leaders are to fill principalship roles. He refers to an effort to achieve such changes by the New York City Board of Education, which is seeking the influx of new men by reducing the years of previous experience needed to become a principal.

Tendencies toward greater openness, as well as the search for new types of leadership, have caused questions to be raised both about graduate admission and certification requirements. Critics argue that these requirements interfere with effective leadership flow into education.

The growing emphasis upon performance criteria poses questions about the adequacy of traditional certification practices and approved program approaches. There is no need to document the rapid growth in demands for professional accountability on the part of educational leaders that have emerged within the past several years. "Accountability" in fact, has become a dominant watchword among both educators and their clients.

A natural outcome of the new emphasis upon accountability has been the devotion of much more attention to performance criteria in the appointment and assessment of leaders. Within the private sector, for example, J. Sterling Livingston has argued persuasively that "there is no direct relationship between performance in school or training programs and records of success in management."[34] A similar argument with respect to the preparation of educational administrators was advanced recently by Edwin Bridges and Melany Baehr.[35] Thus, certification standards tend to be stated in terms of course requirements or "input" measures rather than professional performance requirements or "output" measures. This makes it difficult to meet accountability demands effectively. The same is true for preparing institu-

[33]William Wayson. "A New Kind of Principal," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. L, No. 4, February 1971, pp. 8-19.

[34]J. Sterling Livingston. "The Myth of the Well Educated Manager," Harvard Business Review (January-February, 1971).

[35]Edwin Bridges and Melany Baehr. "The Future of Administrator Selection Procedures," The Administrator's Notebook, Jan. 1971, Vol. 19, No. 5.

tions that use teacher-student ratios, number of books per student, and similar measures rather than criteria of performance of graduates which are clearly related to on-the-job demands. Such conditions raise questions about program effectiveness and the adequacy of certification standards.

Recent court decisions concerned with equal employment opportunities pose the possibility that the legality of certification procedures will be challenged in the future. In July, 1971, Judge Walter Mansfield ruled that New York City had to forsake its traditional examinations for principals because the tests discriminated against Puerto Ricans and blacks. Thus, the New York City Board of Examiners was restrained from giving examinations to prospective principals and from issuing eligibility lists based upon them.

The judge maintained that the Board had to offer positive evidence that the examinations were needed to measure abilities essential to performance in positions for which they were being tested. However, his review of the examinations revealed that the questions "appear to be aimed at the candidate's ability to memorize rather than the qualities normally associated with the school administrator."

Approximately six months before the New York City ruling, Edwin Bridges and Melany Baehr reported research on the guidelines developed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Based upon their studies, they predicted that traditional selection procedures for administrators would be overturned by the Courts unless school officials, especially in urban systems, took special action to make tests significantly related to administrative effectiveness. In addition, Bridges and Baehr reasoned that both certification and graduate courses would be overthrown in the courts unless they were shown to have direct relationships to on-the-job effectiveness. The specific reasoning is set forth as follows:[36]

> "The most frequently used selection criterion in both large and small districts is the administrative certificate; it is obtained by doing graduate work in educational administration and by accumulating credits in other areas typically taken within departments of education. Any individual who is unable to meet these educational requirements is ineligible for consideration as an appointee to an administrative post. In other words, academic preparation of a special type serves as a 'test' for employment; a person simply cannot be hired unless he has this credential.
>
> "If it can be demonstrated that there are proportionately

[36] Ibid., pp. 2-3.

fewer members of minority groups in supervisory positions because they lack the administrative credential, the school district must show that the certification requirement is a valid one, should it be challenged in court. Previous research on administrative effectiveness in education provides a weak base on which to rest claims that formal graduate preparation is a valid criterion. The argument that these studies fail to examine the nature of the training received and fail to consider qualitative differences among training programs is irrelevant because these factors do not currently figure in administrator selection procedures. School officials, as do the researchers, ignore qualitative differences among programs; employment decisions are based on the amount, rather than the quality, of preparation.

"In light of the available evidence, the courts will probably enjoin school officials from using the lack of graduate preparation as a disqualifier if minority groups are adversely affected by this test. The courts will rule that persons must be employed irrespective of their background in graduate education. Furthermore, validity studies must be undertaken to determine whether there are significant performance differences between persons with and without such preparation before this requirement can be used as a selection criterion."

The recently instituted National Program for Educational Leadership poses new questions to certification officers. The National Program for Educational Leadership (NPEL) was instituted in 1970 by a five-university consortium comprised of the City University of New York, Claremont Graduate School, Northwestern University, The Ohio State University, and the University of Texas. In 1971, the North Carolina State Education Agency was added to the consortium. Under a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, these institutions have plans to recruit 100 outstanding leaders from outside the arena of education during the 1970-75 year period, to provide these leaders with academic preparation and field experience on a largely individualized basis, and to place them in posts of educational leadership in school systems. Mid-career persons recruited into the program, for example, have included a vice president of a drug company, a lawyer, and the head of the mental health program in one of America's largest cities.[37] NPEL leaders have stated that individuals with backgrounds such as those just noted have much to offer in the way of fresh and constructive approaches to public education.

[37]See Luvern Cunningham. "The Search for New and Better Prepared Educational Leadership." September 22, 1971. (mimeographed).

Professors responsible for the National Program for Educational Leadership have expressed concern about the teaching experience requirement's impact on those who had been recruited in mid-career from sectors outside education and who had already demonstrated outstanding leadership experience. They expressed the view that these individuals might not be able to achieve the most effective placement because of their lack of teaching experience. Thus, the program and the placement of its graduates pose "live" issues to certification officers.

Perceived Need for Change in Certification Requirements

About two-thirds of the chairmen of departments of educational administration responding to a questionnaire felt that changes in certification requirements should be made. Even though two-thirds felt that changes should be made, only a third of the total population identified specific problems they had encountered with certification. Chairmen in member universities of UCEA had more problems recruiting and placing students because of certification requirements than did those in non-member universities, although the differences were not significant. On the other hand, non-member universities had more difficulty in getting persons admitted to programs than did UCEA member universities, according to the data obtained.

About one-eighth of the respondents felt that teaching experience as a pre-requisite for administrator certification should be eliminated and a number suggested that the teaching certificate should be eliminated as a pre-requisite. Twenty chairmen suggested that the internship should be required in both school and non-school settings. Others emphasized the need for greater flexibility in certification criteria, and a number of individuals stressed the need for performance or competency criteria.

Thirty-nine chairmen suggested that the requirements appearing in certification laws should be stated in minimal or general terms, and the specific nature of preparatory programs should be left to the training institutions. More than a dozen heads of administration departments felt that there should be a periodic updating of training programs and that certification should encourage such efforts.

Professors and students interviewed about specific concerns perceived teaching experience requirements to be the major barrier to talent flow in educational administration. In making the point that teaching experience requirements hinder talent flow, professors gave illustrations of persons seeking entry into preparatory programs from schools of social work, for example, or from other departments in the university who had had no teaching experience. They argued that many of these persons had already demonstrated effective leadership or had clear promise for it, but that they could not become easily qualified for leadership careers in education because of teaching experience requirements in certification.

Evidence of concern was also found among students about achieving effective placement because of teaching experience requirements in certification. The following case description is illustrative of a number of cases which could be provided:

> Tom Sage was educated in a parochial school system. As a high school senior, he became interested in becoming a priest and decided to prepare for this career. Later he enrolled at a seminary where he studied for a number of years.
>
> During his study at the seminary he became disenchanted with his career choice; however, he clung strongly to some basic humanistic values motivating him to pursue a career which would serve his fellow man. Given these values, he decided that he might best pursue his objective within the context of a leadership post in the public schools. An extremely able student, he enrolled in a doctoral program in educational administration at the age of 22. At the time Tom Sage was interviewed, he was completing his doctorate at the age of 25. He wanted very much to enter a leadership position in the schools, but certification requirements bearing upon teaching experience caused him to question the viability of such a move; therefore, he was considering other employment options.

A group of leaders appointed by the United States Office of Education to develop guidelines for preparation programs concluded in 1970 that certification procedures should be liberalized. The Leadership Training Institute in Educational Administration, appointed by those responsible for the Education Profession's Development Act in the U. S. Office of Education, appointed a commission in the late 1960's to develop guiding statements on administrator preparation. Approximately twenty-five leaders in American education, which constituted this group in 1970, in setting forth their views, took the position that certification should be "liberalized." This position was based in part upon the emphasis of the Education Profession's Development Act on recruiting a proportion of administrators in the future from settings other than the conventional ones within public schools and established universities. At the recommendation of the Leadership Training Institute, Donald Davies, who at the time was Associate Commissioner for Education in charge of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, drafted the following statement which was communicated to state education agency leaders:

> "Many forward-looking educators call for the revision of state requirements which would permit the certification of unconventionally recruited and trained teachers and administrators, thereby providing appropriate credentials for highly qualified individuals for positions and responsibilities within the urban school system. Practitioners and

> former practitioners of school administration who are members of the panel of consultants in educational administration serving the U. S. Office of Education's Bureau for Educational Profession Development Act, are among the first to observe that the training which is governed largely by traditional certification requirements equipped them modestly, if at all, for the realities of leadership today, especially in the big cities."

State education agency personnel maintain that there is much more flexibility already available than those in institutions of higher education interested in achieving liberalized requirements are now using. They make this point especially with regard to the content of preparatory programs. They believe that inflexibility resides more in institutions of higher education than in certification requirements or their administration. They maintain that institutions can achieve much greater flexibility if they work with state education agencies through the "approved program" approach, through opportunities for experimentation in new programs, and through the use of "equivalencies." They also tend to believe that the admission requirements of universities present at least as great, if not a greater, problem in talent flow than do certification requirements.

CONCLUSIONS

From the findings already presented, plus additional information that was available to Commission members, a number of conclusions related to preparation and certification can be offered. Among these are the following:

There is a growing discrepancy in the national training capability (as measured by number of programs) and the diminishing training demand for such administrator populations as school principals. In the 1940-70 period both the nation's training demands and training capability grew rapidly. National training capability continues to grow as new preparatory programs are added each year. The pattern of demand, however, is changing sharply as the supply of certified administrators increases and the number of new posts requiring newly prepared personnel decreases. The size of the discrepancy between training capability and demand is unprecedented in educational administration. It will make for increased competition among institutions preparing educational administrators.

The marked discrepancy between training capability and demand will require substantial adaptations both by state education agencies and by training institutions if the negative consequences of overproduction are to be avoided. At the state level better procedures for defining and obtaining data on the supply and demand of different classes of trained administrative personnel will be required for effective manpower planning in educational administration. Computer-based information systems will be required to design required procedures. Training by institutions state-wide will need to be linked to manpower goals. Thus, state-wide identification and communication of training needs will be necessary.

In the fifties and sixties in many institutions substantial change was achieved in almost all of the elements of preparation for educational administrators. The content of preparation became more theory-oriented and was broadened through contact with social science disciplines. Instructional methods were more varied and less teacher-centered. Student populations became more diverse and spent much more time in resident campus programs in full-time study. Trainees had opportunities to learn from social scientists, humanists and professors in business and public administration. Substantial experimentation, internships, surveys and other types of field experience took place and professors of educational administration with more specialized training had a much greater range of reality-oriented instructional materials at their disposal.

The innovations in preparation that were achieved during the fifties and sixties did not diminish the continuing press for improvements and the adaptations in training. Many practicing school administrators have argued that preparation should be much more closely related to practice than it is

currently. Since they place high value upon field experience and problem-oriented teaching, they believe that programs need to achieve further adaptation in these areas. Some administrators feel that the generalizations about communities and organizations should be made more relevant to current and major leadership problems rather than being organized within the context of disciplines. Criticism continues to prevail concerning inflexibility in programs.

Survey data indicate that heads of departments of educational administration are dissatisfied with certain aspects of preparation and have identified areas of preparation they believe need to be improved. Many professors are now engaged in efforts to update and re-design programs.

When certification standards are compared with recent trends in preparatory programs, discrepancies are evident.[38] Differences in certification standards and program trends can be illustrated in various areas. As already noted, for example, there has been a strong trend toward the use of field experience and internships in preparation programs; however, this trend is not reflected widely in certification, since only six states require internships during preparation. Another discrepancy is reflected in the fact that the courses required by state certification regulations are related much more directly to teaching and learning; trends in preparation, on the other hand, emphasize content having more to do with the larger leadership arena within which school leaders must work, as, for example, content on the politics of education, the sociology of communities, the social psychology of groups, management processes in schools, organizational behavior, and so forth. Such discrepancies offer educational leaders in the states significant bases for evaluating preparation programs and certification requirements.

Even though there is criticism of certification standards and processes both within and outside of education, few critics argue that these standards and processes should be eliminated. Kenneth Boulding, for example, after describing some of the negative aspects of certification, has made the following observation:[39]

---

[38]It should be recognized that data on trends in preparation are not entirely comparable to data on certification standards because somewhat differing populations and institutions are involved. Generalizations about certification emphasize practice in states with non-approved programs, while generalizations about trends in preparation are based more upon data about institutions with doctoral programs.

[39]Kenneth E. Boulding. "The Schooling Industry as a Possibly Pathological Section of the American Economy." Review of Educational Research, Winter 1972, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 133-4.

> ....unless there is some distinction between the certified and the uncertified, the incentive to obtain certification is considerably lowered and, if incentive to acquire knowledge and skill is less than the incentive to acquire certification, certification may be the major avenue in society through which a demand for knowledge and skill is encouraged.

To take another example, Bridges and Baehr, while projecting likely legal attacks on local processes for selecting administrators and potential attacks on certification, did not argue for the eradication of certification. Rather, they offered school systems and institutions of higher education guidelines for improving approaches to the selection and preparation in order to eradicate discrimination and to eliminate the likelihood of attacks on certification.[40] Thus, even though limitations in certification standards and processes are increasingly recognized, no one has yet devised an acceptable or feasible alternative to encourage experimentation.

While certification does place barriers on talent flow, it is not as negative a factor as it was assumed to be when the Commission's work was initiated; further, there seems to be much more flexibility within certification systems than is being capitalized upon by the majority of institutions of higher education. The teaching experience requirement, whose maximum period ranged from eight to five years for superintendents and principals respectively, was recognized as a major barrier to talent flow into preparation programs and posts of educational administration. Data obtained, however, revealed that a number of states will now accept individuals who have backgrounds outside of education, such as those currently enrolled in the National Program for Educational Leadership (NPEL). California and Texas, for example, by statute or by state board of educational promulation, would allow NPEL members to serve as school superintendents. There is evidence also that such states as Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, and Minnesota would likely grant waivers to NPEL candidates on an experimental basis. The options of experimental and approved programs also provide institutions opportunities for flexible approaches to preparation.

While there is visible criticism of current certification practices, there is considerable motivation to improve these practices. There is evidence that state education leaders are interested in making state certification systems more responsive to emergent training needs, and in playing a constructive role in helping institutions of higher education achieve needed changes in preparatory programs. Recognized leaders in school districts are also desirous of improving preparatory programs and certification practices. Many leaders in higher education are interested in seeing more flexible uses brought about in preparation programs. An increasing number are desirous

[40] Op. cit., p. 4.

that the system be responsive to the varied backgrounds of students now interested in preparatory programs, and that they have opportunities to experiment with new approaches to preparation.

In sum, then, there seems to be a readiness among leaders in education to upgrade the quality of educational leadership in the public schools of this country through improved preparatory programs and certification practices.

Since criticism is focused largely upon certification practices rather than upon the concept per se, the appropriate strategy is not to reject the concept but to direct efforts toward improving the practices spawned by it. A process for certifying school leaders seems necessary and desirable. Whereas, individuals have ordinarily been certified, society has interests in effective educational leadership that go beyond those of individuals. States, school systems, and institutions of higher education have at their disposal resources to meet society's interests in effective leadership preparation. On balance, society's interests during the last half century have been advanced through certification standards and requirements. Further, even though some criticism has been directed toward certification during the last decade, a reasonable alternative to supplant the process has not yet been conceived or tested. Therefore, efforts should be mobilized to improve talent flow and preparation within the framework of state certification.

In any effort to improve certification processes, it should be recognized that they can have both negative and positive consequences. Certification can cause individuals to spend tedious hours in activities that do not motivate them highly -- while at the same time it opens avenues for potentially new career opportunities. It can reinforce conditions of social inequality -- and yet it offers an orderly system for facilitating the selection and placement of personnel. On the one hand, it can lead to substantial expenditures of funds through the certification of greater numbers of personnel than are needed -- and on the other hand, it offers individuals opportunities to make their own choices about career pursuits. It can limit talent flow, particularly for leaders with unconventional backgrounds -- while attempting to protect the public against incompetent administrative practice. It can be criticized for a lack of adaptations related to recent societal and educational events -- but it has achieved a fifty-year record for reassuring the public about desired talent flow and selection processes in education. It has constrained some training institutions in their career offerings -- at the same time that it has encouraged others to achieve improvement in preparation. An important goal of those concerned with certification, then, should be that of minimizing negative and maximizing positive effects of certification.

State leaders concerned with certification have a growing responsibility not only to protect the public against incompetent school administration but also to increase the excellence and competence of those preparing for entering administrative posts. Originally, the emphasis in certification was upon

protecting the public from incompetence. This remains an important function. However, there is a growing interest in cooperation among state leaders to increase competence. Such an orientation inevitably requires leaders in the various states to achieve more explicit and effective measures of administrator competence. These measures are needed to guide program design, the evaluation of programs, desirable adaptations in state certification standards, and personnel evaluation and development in local school systems. Commission members recognized difficulties in achieving valid and measurable criteria of effectiveness and competence immediately. However, criteria are not only essential to be able to respond effectively to current accountability demands but also to achieve valid progress in selection, preparation, placement, and in-service education in the long range. School systems and institutions of higher education need to cooperate in studies to test and refine criteria to develop knowledge basic to more effective preparation as well as procedures of benefit to practice.

Effective changes in preparation and certification will require joint leadership of those in state education agencies, professional associations, institutions of higher education, local school systems, and leading citizens. The Commission deliberations highlighted the complexities of certification and the fact that operationally it must involve various leaders and agencies in states. It was recognized, for example, that "flexibility" and improvement could not be obtained unless the various parts of the certification system worked in harmony with one another. In the words of Kenneth Ostrander, one of the Certification Commission members:

> Accommodation is the idea most central to the flexibility of social systems. Being helpful, and adapting are activities associated with the idea of accommodation... Expressions of accommodation such as harmonize, reconcile, and serve are also suggestive of the meaning of flexibility in social systems.

A major challenge, then, is to see certification not simply as a set of statements on paper, but as a social system in which leadership can be directed toward improving effective administrator talent flow and preparation. It was also agreed that adaptation requires leaders to deal with conflict between and among the various parts of the system and to achieve means for resolving such conflict effectively.

As efforts to achieve competent leadership progress, the monitoring of general standards will become less important than the creation of conditions and processes for achieving improvements in the flow and preparation of leaders. Those in educational agencies, in other words, will need to encourage school systems and institutions of higher education to achieve closer links and more effective cooperative arrangements designed to confront more directly issues of competence related to certification and preparation.

"Flexibility" is a key concept and suggests a goal which should be pursued in achieving adaptations in certification standards and procedures. The Commission concluded that those responsible in state education agencies should achieve greater flexibility in the administration of requirements in order to adapt to changing situations facing educational administrators and those responsible for preparing them. It was also agreed that leaders responsible for preparatory programs should achieve higher degrees of flexibility in program design and implementation than they have currently realized. Flexibility in preparatory programs would apply not only to learning opportunities for students, but also to the program structure shaping these opportunities. Selection and admission criteria affecting talent flow into preparation programs should also be applied flexibly.

Preparation and certification of educational administrators should be increasingly related to well defined concepts of effective administrative and leadership performance. Admittedly, administrator performance is a complex phenomenon. However, progress can be made and needs to be made in clarifying the objectives of administrator performance and in orienting selection, recruitment, preparation and certification in this direction. Court decisions are highlighting this need; the growing need for systems to evaluate administrator performance for school districts pinpoint the need as do the increasing demands for accountability. Certainly, those offering programs to develop effective performance in administrators need to be clear about the objectives and competencies toward which their efforts are directed. Certification standards and processes must also place a greater emphasis upon criteria of effective administrator performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Actions Aimed at More Effective Manpower Planning in Educational Administration

Educational leaders in the various states should encourage studies of projected supply of and demand for well prepared administrative personnel and encourage leaders to use such studies to achieve needed adaptations in preparatory programs. Among the actions which might be encouraged, are the following:

A. State education agencies, in cooperation with school systems, institutions of higher education and other agencies, should develop better systems for procuring accurate data on the supply of and the projected demand for certified administrator candidates.

B. State education agencies should draw upon the experiences of personnel in such states as Michigan and New York to institute computer-based information systems designed to facilitate administrator manpower studies and needed state planning.

C. State education agency and university leaders should establish procedures for determining state training objectives based upon studies of data on the supply of and demand for newly prepared administrators.

D. State education agencies should play a leadership role in involving scholars and administrators to pinpoint adaptations needed in preparatory programs to meet state training objectives.

E. State leaders in interested organizations should examine patterns of preparation in differing institutions to see if institutional specialization can be advanced and if better divisions of labor among preparing institutions can be evolved.

F. Faced with (1) the need for a higher quality of competently prepared administrators and (2) the prospect that the numbers of newly prepared administrators required throughout the nation will be considerably less in the seventies than in the sixties, states generally should be extremely cautious in approving newly initiated programs for administrators during the period ahead; this is especially true if projected programs do not reflect distinctive new purposes to be achieved or unique designs to be tested.

II. Actions Directed at Relating Preparation and Certification More Closely to Administrator Performance

State leaders from school systems, institutions of higher education, professional organizations, state education agencies, and other interested groups need to center certification standards and processes more upon leadership performance and on the relation of preparation and recruitment to performance. Among the actions which might usefully be taken are the following:

A. Institutions of higher education, in proposing programs for state approval, should be encouraged to state clearly the performance objectives they are seeking to achieve, the measures of effectiveness they will accept as indicators of achievement, the evaluative designs they will use, and the types of information needed to assess results.

B. The use of differing but interrelated bases for deriving performance-oriented program objectives should be encouraged, including: social and educational needs to be met through leadership; critical leadership behaviors related to defined needs; functions to be performed in given posts; competencies required to perform functions; and so forth.

C. State education agency personnel should help prospective program designers see clearly that there is in fact sufficient flexibility in certification to enable the designers to achieve significant experimental programs directed toward leadership performance; such an approach would seem especially pertinent in states having "approved program" approaches.

D. School districts should seek to achieve clearer definitions of administrator performance criteria and better bases for diagnosing performance than those available in most systems; diagnostic data should have immediate value to school systems in staff development decisions and, if used in cooperative studies with institutions of higher education, could shed light on (1) desirable training objectives in resident preparatory programs and (2) the degree to which objectives are being achieved.

E. State education agency personnel, in cooperation with preparing institutions and other interested groups should place less emphasis on maintaining and articulating standards defined in terms of specific and discrete courses and more upon: (1) leadership performance criteria needed for different types of functions and challenges, and (2) logical relationships between desired performance and program experiences designed to develop performance.

F. Field experiences should be used, when feasible, to facilitate needed search for: (1) definitions and measures of performance, and (2)

how these definitions and measures are related to experiences offered in preparatory programs.

G. Leaders in institutions of higher education should develop information systems to enable them to provide valid accounts to interested publics on what objectives they are pursuing in preparation and why they are pursuing given objectives; when feasible, they should also develop cooperative plans with leaders in school districts and/or in other organizations to assess empirically the validity of programs through longevity studies.

H. "Reality-oriented" instructional situations involving cases, simulations, management games, and related materials can and should be used to direct learning and teaching toward competency and performance criteria.

I. Education agencies in cooperation with school district officials, and representatives from all institutions of higher education in given states might sponsor annual audits of preparatory programs; these audits could provide those responsible for preparing educational administrators opportunities to report on their performance and to assess how program outputs are related to emergent training needs and competencies in given states.

J. State education agency personnel should encourage states and school systems to invest in sabbatical leave or other arrangements aimed at upgrading administrator performance through effective in-service or pre-service preparation.

III. Actions Emphasizing the Attainment of Innovations in Preparatory Programs

Given the changing relationships between the supply of and demand for principals and other administrators, leaders in institutions of higher education in most states will need to achieve substantial innovations in preparatory programs during the seventies. Among the adaptation strategies which can be considered by leaders in institutions to guide program innovation are the following:

A. The reallocation of proportionately more resources into the continuing education of school administrators and proportionately less into resident pre-service programs.

B. Achieving a higher quality of preparation and meeting competition by cutting back on the number of students recruited and prepared for existing positions (e.g., the principalship).

C. The radical re-design of selected programs for preparing personnel to enter already existing positions (e.g., the superintendency).

D. The design and implementation of programs to prepare personnel for positions or functions not yet widely prevalent (e.g., directors of continuing education).

E. The design and implementation of programs to prepare personnel for posts or functions not yet in existence (e.g., economic analysts).

F. Recruiting personnel with unique backgrounds (e.g., American Indians) and preparing them to meet special needs in education.

G. The design and implementation of programs to meet leadership needs in multiple organizations (e.g., government, business, and organization).

H. A cooperative effort involving a number of interested institutions of higher education in which each institution would concentrate on a different specialization in preparation and support one another in recruitment and placement.

I. The design and implementation of programs to prepare leaders for non-school and non-higher education settings (e.g., leaders of model cities programs).

J. The allocation of proportionately greater resources into research and development activities designed to improve knowledge and techniques used in programs generally.

IV. Actions Aimed at Achieving Greater Flexibility

State education agencies and institutions of higher education should seek to achieve flexibility in preparatory programs and in the administration of certification requirements through such alternatives as the following:

A. The pattern of the "approved program," now used by more than half the states, should be adopted by other states.

B. State certification processes should encourage experimental programs ---programs oriented toward pioneering new approaches to recruitment and/or preparation.

C. The pattern established by a number of states of accepting "equivalencies" for teaching experience requirements is a sound practice and one that should be diffused to other states.

D. The progress made by state education agencies in recent years toward developing effective reciprocity arrangements in the certification of teachers should be extended to educational administrators; efforts oriented toward this objective should involve representatives of school districts, universities, and professional associations.

E. State education agencies, in cooperation with school districts, preparing institutions, professional organizations, and other interested groups, should develop and experiment with mechanisms for the periodic review of the performance of administrators already certified; while such reviews should be principally and immediately for diagnostic purposes, such experiments might eventually lead to the abolition of permanent certification and the issuance of credentials for specified periods of time as, for example, five years.

F. Institutions of higher education need to seek greater flexibility in admission requirements, especially in relation to the use of data on the cognitive abilities of prospective administrators; such data should be matched by information on such non-cognitive features as courage, vision, drive, and demonstrated leadership actions.

G. Institutions of higher education should seek greater flexibility in field experience and take into account the differing experience backgrounds, career aspirations, and likely job placements of individuals in programs; the following options are illustrative: internships in non-education agencies; internships involving experience in local, state, and national education agencies; internships in the state legislative arena; internships at different levels of urban school systems; internships with senior scholars in research and development centers; internships with outstanding developers in educational laboratories; internships in state or national professional organizations; and so forth.

H. Institutions of higher education should seek to differentiate programs for preparing researchers, developers, administrators, and other specialists since differing competencies are needed for effective performance in these differing specializations and since such differentiation will provide candidates greater flexibility in making career choices.

I. Institutions of higher education should seek greater flexibility in academic offerings during preparation; illustrative options would include the following: independent study arrangements; the design of learning experiences related to differences in student backgrounds and career aspirations; the development and use of modules or units in courses from which students can select; and identifying and expanding the options available in the larger university commun-

ity through offerings in the social sciences and humanities.

A Summary

The UCEA Certification Commission was established to study the impact of certification on talent flow and preparatory programs in educational administration. The study revealed that a range of criticisms have been directed toward certification and preparation during recent years. However, no viable alternative to certification has been proposed or tested. Therefore, the most reasonable course of action is to seek improvements within the existing system of certification requirements and processes. The Commission has offered a number of recommendations designed to improve talent flow, preparation, and certification in educational administration.

Supplementary Bibliography

Droubie, George B. Effecting Interstate Reciprocity in Teacher Certification. Project submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School, University of Minnesota, June, 1972.

Fantini, Mario D. "The Reform of Teacher Education: A Proposal for New York State", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIII, No. 8, April, 1972, p. 476.

Goldhammer, Keith, et al. Elementary Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence. University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1971.

Goldhammer, Keith, et al. Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration. University of Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967.

Goldman, Samuel. To Move a Profession. Presidential Address delivered to the Plenary Session of the University Council for Educational Administration, February, 1972.

Lutz, Frank W. and Ferrante, Reynolds. Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. "Proposed 1972 NAESP Resolutions", Newsletter of NAESP March, 1972.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education. Trenton, New Jersey: NASDTEC assisted by USOE, 1971.

Pirtle, Rodney W. "Flexibility: An Empirical Look at Four Administrator Preparation Programs." Columbus, Ohio: UCEA Commission on the Preparation and Certification of School Administrators, 1972.

JUL 2 1973

THE PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS: SUMMARY OF A UCEA COMMISSION REPORT

EA 005 283

THE PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS: SUMMARY OF A UCEA COMMISSION REPORT[1]

Study Procedures of the UCEA Commission

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission, which are summarized below, are based upon data gained from a variety of procedures: a review of pertinent literature; questionnaires sent to all heads of departments of educational administration; analysis of statistical data on numbers of institutions and numbers of programs for preparing educational administrators; position papers developed by Commission and UCEA staff members; questionnaires sent to certification officers in the 50 states, interviews with selected students in preparatory programs who had unconventional experience backgrounds; and information provided by Commission members during their deliberations.

Selected Findings

Growth in the National Training Capability

1. One measure of the national training capability in educational administration in 1972 was reflected in the fact that 362 institutions were offering programs of preparation; approximately 130 of these institutions were offering doctoral programs.

2. The most rapidly expanding program for preparing educational administrators during the 1940-70 period was the specialist or two-year offering which grew twenty-fold.

3. The least rapidly growing program during the 1940-70 period was the Ph.D. offering; however, its growth accelerated in each decade.

4. The number of students graduating from preparatory programs, especially in the 1960's, grew even more rapidly than did the number of programs.

5. Even in the face of diminishing quantitative training demands projected for the 1970's, the number of institutions engaged in preparing administrators and the number of programs offered will likely continue to expand.

---

[1] In the larger report on which this summary is based are included detailed descriptions of study procedures and the Commission's findings, conclusions, and recommendations. See The Preparation and Certification of Educational Administrators: A UCEA Commission Report. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

6. The number of individuals certified for administrative posts in school systems exceeds substantially the number of openings currently available.

7. The national population of practicing principals in 1980 will be smaller than the 1970 population.

8. The national demand for administrative personnel with doctorates grew sharply in the 1960's because of the creation of many new leadership posts in education beyond those in school systems.

9. The national demand in the early seventies for those with doctorates to enter posts in higher education and related agencies diminished sharply.

10. Only a few state departments of education have gathered and stored data to facilitate state-wide forecasts and manpower planning related to educational administration.

Trends in Preparation Programs

11. Since the late sixties there has been a trend toward stating the purpose of preparation in more specific and operational terms.

12. In the fifties and sixties a movement toward incorporating into preparatory programs concepts, theories, and research findings from the social and behavioral sciences was clearly established.

13. The last decade saw a growing interest in developing new approaches to preparing educational, business, government, and other administrators in common programs.

14. In the mid and late sixties a number of institutions began to incorporate content from the humanities into preparatory programs.

15. The content of preparatory programs during the sixties became considerably more specialized,and staffs in departments of educational administration acquired more discipline- and interdisciplinary-based knowledge and skill.

16. The late sixties and early seventies witnessed new approaches to the achievement of greater flexibility in preparatory programs.

17. Accompanying the trend toward greater flexibility, paradoxically, was a trend oriented toward the attainment of more clearly defined program structure.

18. During the last decade there was a distinct tendency to expand the talent pools from which administrators are recruited; more recently, for

example, institutions have recruited greater numbers of American Indians, blacks, Chicanos and women.

19. For more than a decade, the major trend in instructional approaches has been away from a strong reliance upon the traditional lecture-textbook methods and toward a much more varied methodology supported by cases, simulations, games, and multi-media materials.

20. During the last half of the 1960's and the early 1970's, the quantity and variety of field experiences in preparatory programs increased substantially.

Origins and Purposes of Certification

21. The certification of educational administrators by state education agencies is an American phenomenon.

22. The growth of certification for educational administrators took place almost entirely in this century.

23. Certification for administrators, as for other educational personnel, is a process of legal sanction by states enabling individuals with credentials to be eligible for positions in schools.

24. A long standing and frequently stated purpose of certification is to protect the public against incompetent personnel.

Current Certification Requirements

25. Even though all states except Michigan require some form of certification for prospective principals and superintendents, the experience prerequisites and course requirements for these two administrative roles vary considerably among the states.

26. Trends pointing to greater flexibility in certification are represented in approved program arrangements, experimental program options, reciprocity practices, and the use of equivalencies for teaching requirements.

27. There is some evidence that leaders in institutions of higher education do not fully understand the options available for achieving greater flexibility in programs or, if they do, fail to take advantage of them.

28. A substantial number of states increased certification requirements during the period 1965-70; more recently there has been a tendency to decrease requirements.

Certification Issues of More Recent Origin

29. During recent years some scholars have increasingly argued that there are significantly negative societal consequences to "credentialism" in its various forms, including the certification of personnel and the accreditation of institutions of higher education.

30. Societal tendencies toward increased openness have raised new issues about certification and its impact on effective talent flow into leadership positions.

31. The growing emphasis upon performance criteria poses questions concerning the adequacy of traditional certification practices and approved program approaches.

32. Recent court decisions concerned with equal employment opportunities pose the possibility that the legality of certification procedures will be challenged in the future.

33. The recently instituted National Program for Educational Leadership designed to recruit leaders with non-educational backgrounds has created new issues for certification officers.

Perceived Needs for Changing Certification

34. About two-thirds of the chairmen of departments of educational administration responding to a questionnaire felt that changes in certification requirements should be made.

35. Professors and students interviewed about specific concerns perceived teaching experience requirements to be the major barrier to talent flow in educational administration.

36. A group of leaders appointed by the United States Office of Education to develop guidelines for preparation programs concluded in 1970 that certification standards and procedures should be liberalized.

37. State Education Agency personnel maintain that there is much more flexibility already available than those in institutions of higher education interested in achieving liberalized requirements are now using.

Conclusions

1. There is a growing discrepancy in the national training capability (as measured by numbers of programs) and the diminishing training demand for such administrator populations as principals.

2. The marked discrepancy between national training capability and demand will require states to do more effective manpower planning and institutions to reorient training programs if the negative consequences of overproduction are to be avoided.

3. In the fifties and sixties there was achieved in many institutions substantial change in almost all of the elements of preparatory programs for educational administrators.

4. The innovations in preparation that were achieved during the fifties and sixties have not diminished the continuing press for additional improvement and adaptation in preparatory programs.

5. When current certification requirements are compared with recent trends in preparatory programs, it is evident that the latter are oriented more to the environment of management and leadership while the former are more closely related to curriculum, instruction, and supervision.

6. Even though there is criticism of certification standards and processes both within and outside of education, few critics maintain that these standards and processes should be eliminated.

7. Although certification does place barriers on talent flow, it is not as negative a factor as it was assumed to be when the Commission's work was initiated; further, there seems to be much more flexibility within certification systems than is being capitalized on by the majority of institutions of higher education.

8. While there is visible criticism of current certification practices, there is at the same time considerable motivation to improve these practices.

9. Since criticism is focused largely upon certification practices rather than the concept, per se, the appropriate strategy is not to reject the concept but to direct efforts at improving the practices spawned by it.

10. In any effort to improve certification practices, it should be recognized that the latter can have both negative and positive consequences.

11. State leaders concerned with certification have a growing responsibility not only to protect the public against incompetent school administration through improved preparation and certification, but also to increase the excellence and competence of those entering administrative posts.

12. Effective changes in preparation and certification will require joint leadership of those in state education agencies, professional associations, institutions of higher education, local school systems, and leading citizens.

13. "Flexibility" is a key concept and suggests a goal which should be pursued in achieving adaptations in certification standards and procedures.

14. The preparation and certification of educational administrators should be increasingly related to well-defined concepts of effective administrative and leadership performance.

Recommendations

I. Actions Aimed at More Effective Manpower Planning in Educational Administration

Educational leaders in the various states should encourage studies of projected supply of and demand for well prepared administrative personnel and encourage leaders to use such studies to achieve needed adaptations in preparatory programs. Among the actions which might be encouraged are the following:

A. State education agencies, in cooperation with school systems, institutions of higher education and other agencies, should develop better systems for procuring accurate data on the supply of and the projected demand for certified administrator candidates.

B. State education agencies should draw upon the experiences of personnel in such states as Michigan and New York to institute computer-based information systems designed to facilitate administrator manpower studies and needed state planning.

C. State education agency and university leaders should establish procedures for determining state training objectives based upon studies of data on the supply of and demand for newly prepared administrators.

D. State education agencies should play a leadership role in involving scholars and administrators to pinpoint adaptations needed in preparatory programs to meet state training objectives.

E. State leaders in interested organizations should examine patterns of preparation in differing institutions to see if institutional specialization can be advanced and if better divisions of labor among preparing institutions can be evolved.

F. Faced with (1) the need for a higher quality of competently prepared administrators and (2) the prospect that the numbers of newly prepared administrators required throughout the nation will be considerably less in the seventies than in the sixties, states generally should be extremely cautious in approving newly initiated programs for administrators during the period ahead; this is especially true if projected programs do not reflect distinctive new purposes to be achieved or unique designs to be tested.

II. Actions Directed at Relating Preparation and Certification More Closely to Administrator Performance

State leaders from school systems, institutions of higher education, professional organizations, state education agencies, and other interested groups need to center certification standards and processes more upon leadership performance and on the relation of preparation and recruitment to performance. Among the actions which might usefully be taken are the following:

A. Institutions of higher education, in proposing programs for state approval, should be encouraged to state clearly the performance objectives they are seeking to achieve, the measures of effectiveness they will accept as indicators of achievement, the evaluative designs they will use, and the types of information needed to assess results.

B. The use of differing but interrelated bases for deriving performance-oriented program objectives should be encouraged, including: social and educational needs to be met through leadership; critical leadership behaviors related to defined needs; functions to be performed in given posts; competencies required to perform functions; and so forth.

C. State education agency personnel should help prospective program designers see clearly that there is in fact sufficient flexibility in certification to enable the designers to achieve significant experimental programs directed toward leadership performance; such an approach would seem especially pertinent in states having "approved program" approaches.

D. School districts should seek to achieve clearer definitions of administrator performance criteria and better bases for diagnosing performance than those available in most systems; diagnostic data should have immediate value to school systems in staff development decisions and, if used in cooperative studies with institutions of higher education, could shed light on (1) desirable training objectives in resident preparatory programs and (2) the degree to which objectives are being achieved.

E. State education agency personnel, in cooperation with preparing institutions and other interested groups should place less emphasis on maintaining and articulating standards defined in terms of specific and discrete courses and more upon: (1) leadership performance criteria needed for different types of functions and challenges, and (2) logical relationships between desired performance and program experiences designed to develop performance.

F. Field experiences should be used, when feasible, to facilitate needed search for: (1) definitions and measures of performance, and (2) how these definitions and measures are related to experiences offered in preparatory programs.

G. Leaders in institutions of higher education should develop information systems to enable them to provide valid accounts to interested publics on what objectives they are pursuing in preparation and why they are pursuing given objectives; when feasible, they should also develop cooperative plans with leaders in school districts and/or in other organizations to assess empirically the validity of programs through longevity studies.

H. "Reality-oriented" instructional situations involving cases, simulations, management games, and related materials can and should be used to direct learning and teaching toward competency and performance criteria.

I. Education agencies, in cooperation with school district officials, and representatives from all institutions of higher education in given states might sponsor annual audits of preparatory programs; these audits could provide those responsible for preparing educational administrators opportunities to report on their performance and to assess how program outputs are related to emergent training needs and competencies in given states.

J. State education agency personnel should encourage states and school systems to invest in sabbatical leave or other arrangements aimed at upgrading administrator performance through effective in-service or pre-service preparation.

III. Actions Emphasizing the Attainment of Innovations in Preparatory Programs

Given the changing relationships between the supply of and demand for principals and other administrators, leaders in institutions of higher education in most states will need to achieve substantial innovations in preparatory programs during the seventies. Among the adaptation strategies which can be considered by leaders in institutions to guide program innovation are the following:

A. The reallocation of proportionately more resources into the continuing education of school administrators and proportionately less into resident pre-service programs.

B. Achieving a higher quality of preparation and meeting competition by cutting back on the number of students recruited and prepared for existing positions (e.g., the principalship).

C. The radical re-design of selected programs for preparing personnel to enter already existing positions (e. g., the superintendency).

D. The design and implementation of programs to prepare personnel for positions or functions not yet widely prevalent (e.g., directors of continuing education).

E. The design and implementation of programs to prepare personnel for posts or functions not yet in existence (e.g., economic analysts).

F. Recruiting personnel with unique backgrounds (e.g., American Indians) and preparing them to meet special needs in education.

G. The design and implementation of programs to meet leadership needs in multiple organizations (e.g., government, business, and organization).

H. A cooperative effort involving a number of interested institutions of higher education in which each institution would concentrate on a different specialization in preparation and support one another in recruitment and placement.

I. The design and implementation of programs to prepare leaders for non-school and non-higher education settings (e.g., leaders of model cities programs).

J. The allocation of proportionately greater resources into research and development activities designed to improve knowledge and techniques used in programs generally.

IV. Actions Aimed at Achieving Greater Flexibility

State education agencies and institutions of higher education should seek to achieve flexibility in preparatory programs and in the administration of certification requirements through such alternatives as the following:

A. The pattern of the "approved program," now used by more than half the states, should be adopted by other states.

B. State certification processes should encourage experimental programs ---programs oriented toward pioneering new approaches to recruitment and/or preparation.

C. The pattern established by a number of states of accepting "equivalencies" for teaching experience requirements is a sound practice and one that should be diffused to other states.

D. The progress made by state education agencies in recent years toward developing effective reciprocity arrangements in the certification of teachers should be extended to educational administrators; efforts oriented toward this objective should involve representatives of school districts, universities, and professional associations.

E. State education agencies, in cooperation with school districts, preparing institutions, professional organizations, and other interested groups, should develop and experiment with mechanisms for the periodic review of the

performance of administrators already certified; while such reviews should be principally and immediately for diagnostic purposes, such experiments might eventually lead to the abolition of permanent certification and the issuance of credentials for specified periods of time as, for example, five years.

F. Institutions of higher education need to seek greater flexibility in admission requirements, especially in relation to the use of data on the cognitive abilities of prospective administrators; such data should be matched by information on such non-cognitive features as courage, vision, drive, and demonstrated leadership actions.

G. Institutions of higher education should seek greater flexibility in field experience and take into account the differing experience backgrounds, career aspirations, and likely job placements of individuals in programs; the following options are illustrative: internships in non-education agencies; internships involving experience in local, state, and national education agencies; internships in the state legislative arena; internships at different levels of urban school systems; internships with senior scholars in research and development centers; internships with outstanding developers in educational laboratories; internships in state or national professional organizations; and so forth.

H. Institutions of higher education should seek to differentiate programs for preparing researchers, developers, administrators, and other specialists since differing competencies are needed for effective performance in these differing specializations and since such differentiation will provide candidates greater flexibility in making career choices.

I. Institutions of higher education should seek greater flexibility in academic offerings during preparation; illustrative options would include the following: independent study arrangements; the design of learning experiences related to differences in student backgrounds and career aspirations; the development and use of modules or units in courses from which students can select; and identifying and expanding the options available in the larger university community through offerings in the social sciences and humanities.

A Summary

The UCEA Certification Commission was established to study the impact of certification on talent flow and preparatory programs in educational administration. The study revealed that a range of criticisms have been directed toward certification and preparation during recent years. However, no viable alternative to certification has been proposed or tested. Therefore, the most reasonable course of action is to seek improvements within the existing system of certification requirements and processes. The Commission has offered a number of recommendations designed to improve talent flow, preparation, and certification in educational administration.

Selected and Recent References

Bessent, Wailand and Piele, Philip. The Use of the Computer in Administrator Preparation. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Bridges, Edwin and Baehr, Melany. "The Future of Administrator Selection Procedures." The Administrator's Notebook, January, 1971, Vol. 19, No. 5.

Bruno, James. The Preparation of School Administrators in Quantitative Analysis. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Creamer, Daniel and Feld, Barbara. Some Innovations in the Training of Educational Leaders. New York: The Conference Board, Inc., 1972.

Cronin, Joseph M. and Horoschak, Peter M. Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Culbertson, Jack. "Alternative Strategies of Program Adaptation Within the Future Time Frame of the Seventies." In Samuel Popper(Ed.) Imaging Alternative Future School Organizations,(in preparation).

Culbertson, Jack, Henson, Curtis and Morrison, Ruel. (Eds.) Performance Criteria for Principals: Concepts and Instruments. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Jones Publishing Company, 1973.

Culbertson, Jack,et al. Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies, Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administrators, 1969.

Culbertson, Jack,et al. Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1973.

Farquhar, Robin and Martin, Michael. "New Developments in the Preparation of Educational Leaders." Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1972.

Farquhar, Robin and Piele, Philip. Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Lutz, Frank W. and Ferrante, Reynolds. Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Marien, Michael. "Beyond Credentialism: The Future of Social Selection." Social Policy, October, 1971, Vol. 2, No. 3, p. 14.

Miklos, Erwin. Training-in-Common for Educational, Public, and Business Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Mitchell, Donald and Hawley, Anne. Leadership in Public Education Study. Washington: Academy for Educational Development, 1972.

Stinnett, T. M. A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1970.

Stout, Robert. New Approaches to the Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Wynn, Richard. Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Commission Members and the Organizations Represented*

Howard Bretsch, University of Rochester
George Droubie, Minnesota Department of Education
Charles Faber, University of Kentucky
Byron Hansford, Council of Chief State School Officers
Howard Heding, University of Missouri
Willard Lane, University of Iowa
Elizabeth Lloyd, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
Richard Millard, Education Commission of the States
Kenneth Ostrander, University of Washington
William Pharis, National Association of Elementary School Principals
Craig Phillips, North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction
Gordon Purrington, State University of New York at Albany
Edwin Read, University of Utah
Norman Scharer, American Association of School Administrators
Jay Scribner, University of California at Los Angeles
Theodore Southerland, National Association of Secondary School Principals
Frederick Staub, The Ohio State University
Dustin Wilson, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, United States Office of Education

* Appreciation is expressed to other individuals who accepted membership on the Commission initially but, because of changes in positions, found it necessary to resign: Sidney Marland, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Don Dafoe, University of Alaska; and Robert Binswanger, Director of the Experimental Schools Program, United States Office of Education.

Appreciation is also expressed to David Sperry, University of Utah; James T. Burch and Arthur Taylor of the State Department of Public Instruction in North Carolina; Richard Williams of the University of California at Los Angeles; and Floyd W. Parsons of the American Association of School Administrators for special assistance provided the Commission.